

FILED 07 NOV 2014 32USDC-ORP

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

DEBRA P. ROOD

06-CV-346-SU

Plaintiff,

ORDER

v.

**UMATILLA COUNTY and HEATHER
ELIZABETH LUXTON,**

Defendants.

DAVID H BLACK

HR Juris, PC
10117 S.E. Sunnyside Road
Suite F523
Clackamas, OR 97015
(503) 698-2650

Attorney for Plaintiff

KAREN M. O'KASEY

Hoffman Hart & Wagner, LLP
1000 S.W. Broadway
20th Floor
Portland, OR 97205
(503) 222-4499

Attorneys for Defendants

BROWN, Judge.

Magistrate Judge Patricia Sullivan issued Findings and Recommendation (#46) on September 4, 2007, in which she recommended the Court grant in part and deny in part Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (#27) and Defendants' Motion to Strike (#38). Defendants filed timely Objections to the Findings and Recommendation only as to the recommendation that the Court grant in part and deny in part Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment. The matter is now before this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b).

When any party objects to any portion of the Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendation, the district court must make a *de novo* determination of that portion of the Magistrate Judge's report. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). *See also United States v. Bernhardt*, 840 F.2d 1441, 1444 (9th Cir. 1988); *McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Commodore Bus. Mach., Inc.*, 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981), cert. denied, 455 U.S. 920 (1982).

This Court has carefully considered the Objections of Defendants as to whether Plaintiff had a disability that qualified her for protection under the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12112(a), and whether Defendants denied or interfered with Plaintiff's rights under the Family Medical Leave Act, 29 U.S.C. § 2615(a)(1). The Court concludes Defendants do not provide a basis to modify the Findings and

Recommendation. The Court also has reviewed *de novo* the pertinent portions of the record and does not find any error in the Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendation.

Defendants did not object to the Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendation that the Court grant in part and deny in part Defendants' Motion to Strike. When there are not any objections to the Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendation, this Court is relieved of its obligation to review the record *de novo*. See *Britt v. Simi Valley Unified School Dist.*, 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983). See also *Lorin Corp. v. Goto & Co.*, 700 F.2d 1202, 1206 (8th Cir. 1983). The Court, therefore, has reviewed *de novo* the legal principles related to this portion of the Findings and Recommendation and does not find any error.

CONCLUSION

The Court **ADOPTS** Magistrate Judge Sullivan's Findings and Recommendation (#46) and, therefore, **GRANTS in part** and **DENIES in part** Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (#27) and Defendants' Motion to Strike (#38).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 20th day of November, 2007.



ANNA J. BROWN
United States District Judge